

Remarks

Claims 13-15 and 17-24 are pending. Claims 13-15, 17-20 and 23 are amended. Fig. 2 is also amended. A replacement sheet for Fig. 2 is enclosed. The specification is amended as indicated above. The amendments are made merely for the sake of clarity and, for the sake of clarity in some instances, merely provide synonyms for terms appearing in the originally filed application which was translated from French to English. Objections have been made to Claims 13, 15, 19-20 and 23. Claims 13-15 and 17-24 are rejected.

At the outset the Applicant wants to thank the Examiner for the helpful interview of May 13, 2009 in which the rejections and objections were discussed.

Claims 13-15 and 17-24 are rejected as anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US '374.

Amended Claims 13-15 and 17-24 are not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US '374. This is because, as discussed during the interview, US '374 fails to teach all the elements of the amended claims either expressly or inherently. First, US '374 fails to teach a step of "transforming the original request to construct a modified request for addressing the internal historical database, comprising criteria of the original request and the unique digital identifier of the target state[.]" This transformation of the original request and construction of a modified request is not disclosed in US '374. That is because this is an additional step beyond any initial request that may be disclosed in US '374 to provide "access to a historical database[.]"

Furthermore, it is clear that a "modified request" is different than the "temporal access" referred to in US '374. This is because, in the context of US '374, "temporal access provides a logical view of retrieved data values as a 'snapshot' taken as of the requested access time [(emphasis added)]" and "refers to the ability to perform queries on the database 23 as of a standardized time reference[.]" See US '374 at column 8, lines 9-11; see also column 9, lines 38-44. Stated differently, providing a view of retrieved data values from a prior designated time is clearly different than the step of "transforming the original request to construct a modified request for addressing the internal database[.]" Thus, US '374 fails to teach all the elements of amended Claim 13 or of amended Claims 14-15 and 17-24 which depend on this claim.

US '374 also does not anticipate amended Claim 14. This is because US '374 fails to teach "the at least one additional digital recording of the internal historical database also contains references to other additional digital recording of the internal historical database to specify

connections of dependency of the source-destination type constituting a stream of interferences between data versions [(emphasis added)].” Stated differently, US ‘374 does not teach including such cross-references or cross-links in the internal historical database to other records contained within that database. This is not surprising considering that Fig. 10 teaches “each interested transaction entry … is iteratively processed … to logically reconstruct the database 23 as of … [a] requested query time” and, thus, would not utilize such cross-referenced or cross-linked data in such an iterative process or in the other forms of flow control mentioned. *See* US ‘374 at column 8, lines 30-43.

Amended Claim 15 is not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US ‘374. This is because amended Claim 15 recites the step of “recording a possible result of the logic operation[.]” US ‘374 does not appear to teach this step and it is clear the statement in US ‘374 that “identical query results are guaranteed for any given system version number” is not at all the same as disclosing the recording step recited in amended Claim 15.

Amended Claim 18 is not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US ‘374. This is because amended Claim 18 recites a step of “reading [that] comprises determining the state of the main digital database by referring to the identifiers and to a table of development linked between the states of the main digital database.” The Applicant respectfully submits the disclosure in US ‘374 that “[t]he database is transitioned into successive consistent database versions responsive to each committed transaction” is not at all the same as the reading step of amended Claim 18.

Amended Claim 20 is not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US ‘374. This is because US ‘374 does not teach that “the application brings about modifications in the entire state of the main digital database and gives rise in the instances of an attempt to modify a previous state to creation of new alternatives of digital development of the main database whose data is generated by the same internal historical database [(emphasis added)].” In the context of US ‘374, the recitation of “a modification of the entire state of the main digital database” in amended Claim 20 clearly appears to be a “committed” transaction because the main database has been modified. Additionally, the recited “creation of new alternatives of digital development of the main database” in amended Claim 20 also appears to be a “committed step[.]” In contrast, the cited portions of US ‘374 relate to the storage of “uncommitted transactions” which are those that have not yet occurred and will not occur until a designated “commit time[.]” Additionally, the Applicant notes the recitation in amended Claim 20

that “data is generated” also implies a “committed step” as that term appears to be used in the context of US ‘374.

Amended Claim 21 is not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US ‘374. This is because amended Claim 21 recites that “one or more dependent links serve as a recovery criteria for said operations already carried out [(emphasis added).]” “[O]perations already carried out” as recited in amended Claim 21 are “committed transactions” as that term appears to be used in the context of US ‘374. This means that the disclosure in US ‘374 reciting “[r]ollback segments for uncommitted transactions are stored [(emphasis added)]” refers to “uncommitted transactions” and is different than “committed” operations that have already been carried out. This is because it is the Applicant’s understanding that the embodiment of US ‘374, that appears most relevant to the disclosure of US ‘374 cited in the rejection, seems to involve creating a record of uncommitted transactions which are stored and then, at a later “commit time[,]” used to update the main database.

Amended Claim 22 is not anticipated under 35 USC §102(e) by US ‘374. This is because US ‘374 does not teach “integrating or merging updates carried out on various branches into the framework of new state inheriting these branches.” The Applicant respectfully submits that the recitation in US ‘374 that “[t]he databases transitioned in a consecutive successive consistent database version responsive to each committed transaction at a journal commit time” is different and entirely irrelevant to the “integrating step” of amended Claim 22.

Altogether, the above makes it clear that US ‘374 fails to teach all the elements of amended Claims 13-15 and 17-24 and, thus, cannot anticipate these claims. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejections of the amended Claims 13-15 and 17-24 under 35 USC §102(e).

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/vbm
(215) 656-3381